

Record: 1

Title: Emerging Definitions of Leadership in Higher Education.

Authors: Eddy, Pamela L.
VanDerLinden, Kim E.

Source: Community College Review; Jul2006, Vol. 34 Issue 1, p5-26, 22p

Document Type: Article

Subject Terms: EDUCATION, Higher -- Research
LEADERSHIP
COMMUNITY colleges
DEVELOPMENT leadership
COLLEGE administrators
LEADERS

Abstract: The higher education literature suggests that alternative leadership styles are replacing the traditionally held definitions of leadership and provide new and different (and possibly superior) ways to understand leadership. This 'article looks for parallels within the current leadership literature to see if community college administrators use the alternative language or emerging definitions of leadership to self-describe their own leadership or if their self-descriptions fit the more traditional hierarchical ideal of the positional or "hero" leader. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

Copyright of Community College Review is the property of Sage Publications Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use. This abstract may be abridged. No warranty is given about the accuracy of the copy. Users should refer to the original published version of the material for the full abstract. (Copyright applies to all Abstracts.)

Lexile: 1290

Full Text Word Count: 7630

ISSN: 00915521

Accession Number: 25223207

Database: MasterFILE Premier

Emerging Definitions of Leadership in Higher Education**New Visions of Leadership or Same Old "Hero" Leader?**

The higher education literature suggests that alternative leadership styles are replacing the traditionally held definitions of leadership and provide new and different (and possibly superior) ways to understand leadership. This article looks for parallels within the current leadership literature to see if community college administrators use the alternative language or emerging definitions of leadership to self-describe their own leadership or if their self-descriptions fit the more traditional hierarchical ideal of the positional or "hero" leader.

Keywords: leadership styles; positional leader; leadership development; administrators

Challenges and opportunities exist simultaneously in the administrative and leadership ranks of our colleges and universities. The current context of higher education is shaped by the decline of institutional resources (Johnstone, 1999), changing student demographics (Hurtado & Dey, 1997), shifts in teaching to student-centered learning (Barr & Tagg, 1995), the impact of technology on faculty roles (Baldwin, 1998), and the paradigm shift from an industrial age to an information age (Dolence & Norris, 1995). The historical demand-response nature of community colleges pushes for strategic responses on the part of leaders (Gumport, 2003). Although the calls for leadership to address challenges and take advantage of opportunities are not new, the emerging definitions of what it means to be an institutional leader or practice leadership are changing.

Throughout the last half of the 20th century, scholars spent considerable time postulating the requirements for and definitions of leadership. A scan of recent books published in higher education literature suggests that an interest in leadership continues to prevail (see, for example, Astin & Astin, 2000; Bowen & Shapiro, 1998; Chliwniak, 1997; Davis, 2003; Nidiffer, 2001). In addition to investing much time and energy studying leadership in the academy, colleges and universities, as well as local, state, and national associations and organizations, have devoted valuable resources to fund and send campus members to leadership training workshops and programs. In 2003, for example, the American Association of Community Colleges offered a Future Leaders Institute. The Institute targeted senior administrators and had the stated objectives of instilling the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary for successful leaders. Yet: with all these expended resources and pursuits, a question remains: Have the traditionally held definitions of leaders and leadership changed substantially within the ranks of administrative leaders?

The literature suggests that alternative leadership styles are replacing the traditionally held definitions of leadership and provide new and different (and possibly superior) ways to understand leadership. According to Davis (2003), leadership has been recognized as an activity that can "bubble up" in various places within institutions and no longer is only focused on formal leadership roles. Discussions of leadership throughout the organization (Peterson, 1997), team leadership (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993), servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears & Lawrence, 2003), transformative leadership (Burns, 1978), inclusive leadership (Helgesen, 1995), and the role of followership (Kelley, 1998) have replaced the traditional discussions of the "great man" or "hero" leader.

Alternative definitions of leadership demand rethinking the traditional images and the traditional relationships associated with leaders and followers (Green, 1997). Central to this rethinking is the transition from theoretical discussions of appropriate leadership to the actual practice of leadership at colleges and universities. To that end, this article looks for parallels within current leadership literature to see if community college administrators use the alternative language or emerging definitions of leadership to self-describe their own leadership or if their self-descriptions fit the more traditional hierarchical ideal of the positional or "hero" leader. The following research questions are addressed:

How do community college administrators self-report their leadership role at their institutions?

Do female and male administrators use similar language and categories when describing themselves as leaders?

Do administrators have varying views of their leadership based on administrative position?

Addressing these questions will illuminate the challenge of applying the leadership rhetoric advanced in higher education discourses to the actual institutional settings in which leaders find themselves.

Literature Review

The literature on leadership is as plentiful as it is diverse. Several definitions of leadership as well as theories of leadership exist. Some authors strive for a concise definition and understanding of leadership. For example, according to Davis (2003), the term leadership implies movement, taking the organization or some part of it in a new direction, solving problems, being creative, initiating new programs, building organizational structures, and improving quality (p. 4). Others, however, struggle with the complexity of leadership. Bass and Stogdill (1990) reported on more than 3,000 empirical investigations of leadership, which provided varied conceptions of what leadership means. In light of the lack of precision regarding leadership definitions, Bimbaum (1992) said, "Any comprehensive consideration of academic leadership must be able to accommodate both the strong leader and the weak leader views, because evidence suggests that while both may be incomplete, both are in some measure correct" (p. 8).

Rost (1991) noted that traditional leadership scholars and the theories they developed were concerned with the peripheries of leadership, such as traits, personality characteristics, and whether leaders are born or made. Rost went on to explain that leadership scholars are interested in the components of leadership and what leaders need to know to be influential in an organization. Less research has been "aimed at understanding the essential nature of what leadership is, and the processes whereby leaders

and followers relate to one another to achieve a purpose" (p. 4). In the postindustrial era, Rost argued, change would be undergirded by values such as collaboration, common good, global concern, diversity and pluralism in structures and participation, client orientation, civic virtues, freedom of expression in all organizations, critical dialogue, qualitative language and methodologies, substantive justice, and consensus-oriented policy-making processes. An understanding of leadership within the realm of higher education relies upon the spectrum of various leadership theories purported over time and across disciplines. In early discussions of leadership, definitions and understandings coalesced around the 19th-century notion of the "great men" and their impact on society (Heifetz, 1994). Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) completed a comprehensive exploration of the theories and models of leadership within higher education. These authors classified the theories into the following six categories: trait theories, power and influence theories, behavioral theories, contingency theories, cultural and symbolic theories, and cognitive theories. Several aspects of these theories are relevant to community college leadership discussions.

Leadership Within Community Colleges

Community colleges, perhaps more so than 4-year institutions, are facing what some call a leadership crisis, as some 79% of 2-year college presidents plan to retire in the next 8 years (Evelyn, 2001; Schults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). This projected rapid turnover in administrative positions, however, presents an opportunity to "bring in fresh blood at a time when two-year Colleges face increasingly complex demands" (Evelyn, 2001, p. A36) and may present an opportunity to embrace new and emerging definitions and enactments of leadership.

The historical development of public junior colleges, from the establishment of the first public junior college in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901 (Cohen & Brawer, 2003) to the birth of the modern-day community college in the 1960s, provides a relatively short history and limited research literature from which to draw information. Twombly (1995) reviewed four eras of community college leadership, including the period from 1900 to the 1930s, in which the "great man" theory dominated; the 1940s to 1950s, in which leaders sought to become independent from secondary schools and forge an identity of their own; the 1960s to 1970s, in which the present-day version of the community college was born with the strong, dominant leadership that was necessary during those pioneering days; and the 1980s to 2000, when attention to resource issues was more necessary, and models from business began to be used that emphasized efficiency and strategic planning (Rowley & Sherman, 2001).

Vaughan's (1986) book *The Community College Presidency* provided a profile of leaders of 2-year institutions. This portrait of the presidency stressed qualities of community college presidents including integrity, judgment, courage, and concern for others (p. 4). At the time of Vaughan's writing in the late 1980s, community college presidents and other constituents were just beginning to discuss the roles of subordinates and the importance of relationships. By 1989, Vaughan was writing about leadership in transition at community colleges. His work began to move beyond the personal descriptions of presidential traits to acknowledge the change from the "builder" presidents at community colleges to leaders with a broader range of duties. In his 1989 book *Leadership in Transition* (Vaughan, 1989b), women and minority presidents were acknowledged for having a role in community college leadership, thus marking and acknowledging a change in the demographic profile of community college presidents. In 1991, for example, 89% of community college presidents were males and 11% were minorities. A decade later, this percentage had shifted, as 28% of presidents were women and 14% were people of color (Weisman & Vaughan, 2002).

Building on the research by Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) that argued that transformational leaders sought to heighten followers' awareness about issues of consequence and subsequently change followers' goals and beliefs, Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989) examined and categorized exemplary community college leaders using transformational behavioral attributes. Roueche et al. used five themes for analysis: Transformative leaders (a) believe in teamwork and shared decision making, (b) value people both as members of the team and as individuals, (c) understand motivation, (d) have a strong personal value system and, finally, (e) have a vision of what their college can become (p. 12). Roueche et al. concluded that leaders are most effective when they empower others.

During the 1990s, community colleges faced a decline in economic resources, a change in student

composition with more adults turning to the community college for their educational needs, and a push to offer more community development programming. These forces necessitated a different kind of community college leader. Baker and Associates (1992) argued for cultural leadership, recognizing the interdependence of organizational culture and leadership. Their research draws from leadership theory based on culture and symbolic management of meaning by college presidents. How leaders help create meaning for others in a given cultural context is at the heart of cultural leadership.

In the late 1990s, many community colleges embraced the concept of the learning college (O'Banion, 1997). Conceptions of leadership under this organizational paradigm call for shared leadership: "It means embracing organizational learning so leadership will be a responsibility shared by all members based on understanding, competence, and creativity" (Gratton, 1993, p. 103). One manifestation of shared leadership involves conceptions of shared governance. Lucey (2002) argued that in shared governance institutional members have specific roles, that faculty are responsible for academic and curricula issues and decisions, and that administrators are accountable for institutional strategy and decisions regarding resource allocation. Shared leadership calls for followers to be active and accountable.

The recognition of the role of followers and shared leadership argues for new conceptualizations of what it means to be a community college leader. The shift from early founder to multitask manager requires an emphasis on communication, restructuring of organizational reporting and responsibilities, and a call for accountability (Lewis, 1989). Shifts in decision making over time, from within the exclusive domain of the president to a more participatory process involving shared governance, reflect changes in community college leadership.

Gender and Leadership

At community colleges, women currently occupy approximately 28% of all presidencies. Women also represent 21% of deans of instruction positions (or similarly titled positions such as vice president for academic affairs or chief academic officer) at community colleges (Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). Because the prime pathway to the community college presidency remains through the provost or the senior academic affairs administrator, it is likely that the future will show more women heading community colleges.

As noted above, conceptualizations of college presidents' approach to leadership has changed from the "take charge," "great man" approach to approaches emphasizing participatory and shared decision making--approaches that are more often associated with women leaders (Chliwniak, 1997). Several authors (DiCroce, 1995; Getskow, 1996; Vaughan 1989a) have suggested ways in which women leaders can influence the culture of the community college and improve future opportunities for women: (a) Encourage the elimination of institutional gender stereotypes, (b) redefine power and the power structure of the institution, (c) enact gender-related policies and procedures, (d) raise collegial consciousness and initiate collegial dialogue on gender and related issues, and (e) take a proactive stance on public policy and debate beyond the local campus. As more women hold the top position on community college campuses, norms regarding the presidency and leadership will begin to change.

Literature on women's leadership suggests more sharing of power and a participatory orientation to leading (Chliwniak, 1997; Townsend & Twombly, 1998). Townsend and Twombly (1998) argued, however, that a feminist orientation toward leadership at the community college must be centered on attention to women's issues and needs versus general campus issues. And Glazer-Raymo (2003) contended that, in analyses, gender needs to be considered as an analytic category versus merely a demographic variable in order to formulate policy that adequately addresses the needs of women.

Leadership Throughout the Organization

New conceptions of "leadership look at leadership as a process in which leaders are not seen as individuals in charge of followers, but as members of a community of practice" (Homer, 1997, p. 277). One model for this type of leadership is distributed leadership (Gronn, 2000). Rather than leadership formed on a dualistic premise, the responsibility for leading the college is shared throughout the organization. Instead of a focus on the sole positional leader of the president, the interdependencies of the relationship are emphasized, in which roles change over time. The modification of strict roles over

time makes the differentiation between leader and follower increasingly arbitrary (Birnbaum, 1992).

Multidimensional leadership is "likely to be the result of a team effort or of participation at differing levels, rather than the capacity of a single individual" (Peterson, 1997, p. 154). Similarly, Helgesen (1995) conceptualized leadership as a web in which there is structure but also an ever-evolving shape. The leader at the center of the web works on building consensus and valuing the parts of the web--parts that are built on relationships.

The emphasis on the learning organization (O'Banion, 1997) also supports new conceptions of leadership in which "presidents and senior administrative staff need to be comfortable with fluid organizational dynamics that promote continuous learning, rigorous analysis and creative responses at all levels of the organization" (Dever, 1997, p. 62). Learning organization tenets suggest that involvement of and feedback from followers within the organization are critical for organizational Success.

Although different authors use a variety of terms in describing leadership throughout the organization (e.g., shared leadership, distributed leadership, multidimensional leadership, web of inclusion, and such), each author and corresponding theory chooses not to focus on the hierarchical leader in the organization. Instead, leadership is described more in terms of relationships. In addition to the roles of leaders, the roles of followers are also highlighted as essential to organizational success. This study examines whether these new conceptualizations of leadership are present in the community college administrative ranks.

Method

The data reported here come from a national survey of community college administrators. The survey instrument consisted of 34 questions and was pilot tested with community college administrators, two peer reviewers, and a panel of three experts from the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). A stratified random sample of 1,700 community college administrators across 14 position codes was drawn from the AACC databank, providing representation by geographic location, urban and rural locales, and single campus and multicampus sites. During early 2000, letters of introduction and survey packets were mailed, extensive electronic and phone follow-ups were conducted, and a second mailing was distributed, yielding a response rate of 54% (n = 910) usable surveys.

For this study, the question of interest was an open-ended question that asked administrators if they considered themselves to be leaders at their institutions and, if so, why. Of the survey respondents, 682 responded to this question. Content analysis was used to analyze the responses. Content analysis is a research method that allows for the counting and tallying of categorized themes within data. Content analysis has been described as a systematic and replicable technique for compressing many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding (Stemler, 2001).

Emergent coding of the responses was used. Categories were established after some preliminary examination of the data. Following the steps outlined by Haney, Russell, Gulek, and Fierros (1998), the two researchers independently reviewed the responses and developed a set of categories that formed a checklist. The researchers then compared checklists to reconcile any differences between lists. After extensive discussion, the two checklists were consolidated, and both researchers coded the responses independently. Interrater reliability was high (85% agreement between the two reviewers).

Limitations of content analysis are that it is inherently reductive, especially when dealing with complex topics, and leads to some simplistic choices that may limit analysis. For example, many of the responses reviewed had more than one code, but for analysis purposes, we chose only the primary code.

Findings

Research Question 1: Self-Reporting of Leadership Role on Campus

Content analysis of the 682 responses resulted in 11 primary classifications of responses regarding categorization of leadership (see Table 1). Each category is discussed in more detail below with the corresponding percentages of responses that fell into that category.

The first category of responses exemplified the traditionally held definitions of leadership and related to positional leadership. Respondents in this category stated that the position required them to be leaders. Other respondents discussed making decisions within functional areas and fulfilling job responsibilities such as serving on important institutional committees. Respondents also discussed their years of experience in the position. Responses that typified this category included: "I am part of the Executive Committee of the college and I have major institutional responsibility," and "[I am a leader] by virtue of my position and my history of leadership here." Approximately 47% of responses fell within this classification.

A second category of responses related to initiating change, taking on the change agent role, or making the environment conducive for change. Some responses that illustrate this category are: "I am a transformational change agent," and "I have taken on numerous new projects and am considered an innovator." Nine percent of responses were classified in the change category.

Providing vision and direction were the defining phrases in the third category of responses. Seven percent of responses spoke of vision, including the following: "I set the tone, shape and communicate the visions, and position the college on critical issues"; and "I am responsible for developing, cultivating, and implementing the institutional vision."

A similar percentage of respondents (6.6%) indicated that they were leaders at their institutions because of the knowledge and expertise they possessed. Many of the responses that fell into this category spoke about personal mastery. Examples of such responses included the following: "I am recognized statewide for expertise in my field," and "I am called upon often for insight and recommendations."

Some respondents (4.5%) believed that they were leaders because others saw them in that light and because they were trusted and respected on their campuses. As one respondent wrote, "My views and suggestions are received with respect." Another administrator wrote, "I have the trust and confidence of faculty and administrator."

Rather than indicating personal characteristics when asked if they were leaders on campus, approximately 3% of the administrators discussed fulfilling the mission of the college. For example, one administrator wrote, "I play a key role in advancing the mission of the institution through my work." In a similar sentiment, another administrator wrote, "[I have the] ability to understand the mission and focus people and community towards the mission."

Although writings on empowerment abound in the literature, few administrators (3.1%) discussed empowering others, mentoring, advocating for others, role modeling, or motivating others as reasons why they were leaders at their institutions. One administrator explained, "I have been able to motivate and support faculty and colleagues to accomplish their goals." Another wrote, "I try to pull together the resources necessary for others to do their job."

A surprisingly small percentage of administrators (1.9%) talked of team leadership. Examples of statements from those who did are: "I am viewed as a leader who values participative decision-making and team approaches" and "I consider myself a team player who leads when appropriate"

Approximately 2% of respondents spoke of their influence, power, and authority as being reasons why they were leaders at their institutions. For example, one administrator said, "I have power, influence, and respect." Similarly, another administrator explained, "I seem to be able to successfully influence faculty/staff."

Two percent of administrators focused solely on their success and their ability to get the job done as the reasons why they were leaders at their institution. As one administrator explained, "I get things done for the college when I see a need--job description or not." Another administrator stated, "People look to me to make things happen. I do."

And finally, close to 6% of the respondents did not believe that they were leaders at their institutions.

Many stated that they faced barriers to leadership or that they were too new in their positions at their institutions to be leaders. One administrator wrote, "[It is] difficult if not impossible to be a leader at this institution unless you are a faculty member or came from faculty ranks." Another indicated, "My area of responsibility is secondary to the primary mission of the institution," whereas yet another stated, "I consider myself a colleague more than a leader."

Research Question 2: Women's and Men's Descriptions of Leadership

In dividing the coded data set based on gender, the categorizations of responses showed no significant difference based on sex. Some qualitative differences, however, are worth noting (see Table 2).

Although not statistically significant, a slightly higher percentage of men than women were likely to describe their leadership based on their position and responsibilities (49.2% of men compared to 45.1% of women). As one male stated, "My title says I am supposed to be a leader." Likewise, women referred to their positional location but often did so in terms of their experience and roles of responsibilities: "Yes. I have a position with a great deal of responsibility and continue to be put into leadership positions on task forces and committees."

Another area with a slightly higher percentage of male responses was within the category of "me-centered." Men were more likely than women to describe their leadership with themselves as the focal point (3.3% of men compared to 1.7% of women). One male respondent said, "Yes, [I am a leader] because I have the ability to make things happen" On the other hand, a woman respondent in this category noted, "Yes, I get things done." Whereas both of these responses are coded for "me-centered," the orientation of the male respondent is to his ability to influence others to make things happen, versus the woman respondent, who sees herself as the person actually doing things.

In the category related to knowledge and personal mastery, a slightly higher percentage of women were more likely than men to consider themselves a leader given their expertise (8.0% of women compared to 6.1% of men), although, again, this difference was not statistically significant. One female respondent commented, "My advice is often sought, as are my skills." A male respondent in this area said, "I am considered an expert on technical education by upper administration and my peers in this institution and throughout the state." The adage of "knowledge is power" provides the backdrop for this leadership definition. In the examples cited, the female leader focused on her skills, whereas the male response focused on his expertise.

Finally, although not representing a large portion of the sample, a slightly larger percentage of women defined their leadership as based on their ability to collaborate and build teamwork (2.8% of women versus 1.3% of men). A female commented, "I try to bring consensus in our decisions--try to include people in the decision-making process. I'm not afraid, however, to make an unpopular decision based on what is right." Similarly, one male leader wrote, "I am viewed as being a leader who values participative decision-making and team approaches."

Research Question 3: Varying Views of Leadership Based on Administrative Position

Differences in responses were measured among six different position categorizations: presidents and provosts, academic affairs, student affairs, occupational and continuing education, administrative areas (e.g., business affairs, institutional research, human resources, and development), and learning resources and distance education (see Table 3). The significant differences in positional categorizations of responses are reported below, along with notable qualitative differences.

Presidents/Provosts

A historical trait of leadership is the ability to provide vision (Roueché et al., 1989). Presidents and provosts were more likely than administrators in the other positions to indicate that they provided vision and shaped the direction of the college, as close to 20% of presidential responses referenced vision. As one president stated, "I provide a focused vision for the future." Another president commented, "I have an overall vision of the college as integral to the community and have moved it successfully toward being recognized as such."

Academic Affairs Administrators

Academic affairs administrators were more likely than presidents and provosts or those in administrative areas (business affairs, institutional research, human resources, and development) to indicate in their responses that others saw them as leaders. As one vice president of academic affairs answered, "People react to me as if I am a leader." Some academic administrators referred both to their position in the administrative hierarchy as well as to expectations placed on them by colleagues, "As [the] #2 person at the college, a lot of people look to me for guidance and expect me to provide leadership."

Although not statistically significant, other identifying factors showed up differently for those responding from positions in academic affairs. Those administrators working in academic affairs indicated more often than presidents that they were a change agent (10.7% of academic affairs administrators compared to 4.7% of presidents). As one academic dean stated, "By nature I am a strategic planner and motivator. Both skills have resulted in change." Another director commented, "I have spearheaded several initiatives with success" capturing the immediate connection between plans and actions.

Those in academic affairs also identified themselves as a leader due to their knowledge or mastery more often than presidents or provosts (6.9% of academic affairs administrators compared to 1.2% of presidents). As midlevel administrators, these employees' job function is tied more directly to particular tasks or functions, making mastery of an area a sought-after leadership quality for those in charge. One director's comment--"I have led in my area of specialty"--illustrates the idea that knowledge and mastery convey leadership for these administrators. Finally, academic affairs respondents indicated that they were a leader because others see them as a leader (8.4% of academic affairs administrators compared to 1.2% for presidents and provosts).

Student Affairs Administrators

A relatively high percentage (11.2%) of student affairs administrators indicated that they were change agents at their colleges. The day-to-day interaction that student affairs personnel have with students may be a contributing factor for this high percentage. Being a change agent may be expected within student affairs as it is constantly necessary to make adjustments to meet student needs. As one dean of students commented, "I am a problem-solver and integrator." The bridge between student affairs and academic affairs highlights collaboration for student learning (Kezar, 2003), and this collaboration was reflected in some of the responses. According to a dean of students, "I am regularly involved in building momentum and clearing the path for new initiatives." The ability to adapt quickly to changing cultural norms and student development issues is key for student affairs employees. According to one vice president of student affairs, "I have the opportunity to go as far with new ideas/programs as I want. I'm encouraged to be innovative."

Occupational and Continuing Education Administrators

Occupational and continuing education administrators, as compared to the other positional categories, were very similar in their responses to the question, "Do you consider yourself a leader at your institution?" This group of administrators was more likely than presidents and academic affairs administrators to indicate that they were not leaders at their institutions, however. One vice president of occupational education stated, "Ours is a very autocratic institution where second level administrators do not have a voice in the administration of the institution." And one director of continuing education noted, "President's actions indicate he desires to be the only leader; others have difficulty asserting leadership."

Administrative Areas (Business Affairs, Institutional Research, Human Resources, and Development)

This group of administrative personnel had the highest percentage that indicated they were leaders because of their positions (although it was not statistically significant across most positions). Perhaps due to the nature of their work, this group of administrators readily referred to their positional duties: "I manage several key operations on campus"; "I am in a high profile position which requires me to plan and oversee events"; and "I direct institutional assessment planning; overall coordination of Title III grant,

and am responsible for federal and state enrollment reporting."

Learning Resources/Distance Education Administrators

Those in charge of learning resources and distance education programs were more likely than the other position categories to indicate that they were not leaders at their institutions or that they were experiencing leadership barriers. Administratively, those located in this category are seemingly among the lower ranks of the hierarchy. One director of learning resources noted, "It is difficult if not impossible to be a leader at this institution unless you are a faculty member or came from faculty ranks." One director of distance education commented, "My area receives low priority." Individuals in this category perceived their positions as marginalized in the organization. Quite telling was the lack of respondents in this category using the self-descriptors of setting the vision for the campus or of having influence or power. None of the administrators in these positions identified themselves by using either of these descriptors.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings from this research indicate that despite calls for new forms of leadership, the survey respondents still largely viewed themselves as leaders primarily due to their position. What is encouraging, however, is that although no other single definition of leadership ranked as high as position, cumulatively, the nonposition responses account for half of the descriptors. Thus, administrators are now conceiving of themselves as leaders using expanded ideals beyond just position.

Few differences existed in how men or women defined their leadership. Where there were slight percentage differences based on gender, the male and female responses were captured in stereotypical ways: namely, the view of male leadership as more directive and autocratic (based on position; me-centered) and female leadership as more participatory and valuing meritocracy as measured by value of knowledge (create environment for change; knowledge mastery; working for the good of the college). These findings suggest a need to think differently about gender and leadership. The weak differences found in defining leadership by gender underscores that gender is not always the defining variable of difference in how one chooses to lead. Rather, colleges may need to concentrate instead on institutional structures that may act as barriers or impediments for the advancement of women (VanDerLinden, 2003).

Those in the position of president or provost were more likely to see themselves as shaping the direction of the college. Although being a visionary is often typically ascribed to these positional leaders, it is not without a cost. Pfeffer (1991) reported that presidents, as the positional leaders on campus, were limited in the amount of power and control at their disposal. The findings reported here continue to bear out this claim. Administrators in academic affairs and those located at different levels in the administrative hierarchy perceive themselves as having more ability to enact change. Part of the reason for this finding may be that midlevel administrators have fewer areas of control in their domain and therefore can exert more influence on those areas actually within their control. Also, the president and provost roles are more publicly visible, both on campus and to the larger community. Actions taken by these positional leaders are more scrutinized and involve more political negotiation among competing parties.

Presidents and provosts were not likely to say they were leaders because others see them as such. Instead, the perception others have of these campus leaders was implicit based on their organizational chart positions at the top of the hierarchy. In general, presidents and provosts did not define their leadership using concepts of teams or empowering others. And it was student affairs personnel and those in learning resources who saw themselves most often as working to fulfill the mission of the college. These personnel perceived direct ties between their leadership and the work of the college. As visionary leaders, presidents and provosts again may have made assumptions about their leadership roles, assuming that their work inherently fulfills the mission of the college.

The findings related to positional differences indicate more variation amongst positions, as compared to gender differences. These findings raise interesting questions regarding the route to the presidency. Because fewer leadership differences were accounted for by gender and more by position, the question becomes, Is it a person's position that elicits different conceptions of leadership? Viewing the findings

by position indicated that along with additional influence as one moves up the administrative hierarchy, one also assumes additional limitations. Barriers were also perceived by those located further down the organizational hierarchy in learning resources or distance education. Barriers faced by these lower level administrators may be due to the marginalization of these organizational units in the college.

Implications

If community colleges want to embrace the ideal of participatory leadership and leadership throughout the organization, organizational structures and the mindsets of leaders may need to change. Currently there is still a reliance on the bureaucratic and reporting hierarchy in how administrators see themselves as leaders. Given that more women are ascending to positions of power on campus, community colleges may witness a change. New definitions and models of what it means to lead a community college campus may become more apparent and move in the direction of increased emphasis on participation and team leadership.

Community colleges have been previously described as bureaucratic in orientation--meaning that "structures are established to efficiently relate organizational programs to the achievement of specified goals" (Birnbaum, 1992, p. 107). Historically, this organizational orientation reifies and values positional leadership over other types. The question remains: Have the structures of community colleges evolved to allow for and support other conceptions of leadership? The findings from this research indicate a qualified yes.

Many of the responses provided more than one definition of leadership. The administrators' primary responses formed the basis of the findings reported here. The multiple coding of the responses, however, indicates that individuals are thinking more complexly about leadership, rather than merely attributing it to position or one characteristic. Providing ways to support expanded definitions of leadership is critical. Leadership development and training opportunities are an opportune time to nurture expanded conceptions of what it means to be a leader. The expected leadership turnover in community colleges during the next decade provides such an opportunity for change.

Table 1 Coding Scheme

Code Content

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Positional, responsibilities, committees, decision making, related to job function, experience, leader within area |
| 2 | Change agent, initiate change, create environment for change |
| 3 | Provide vision, shape direction |
| 4 | Knowledge, personal mastery, expertise, frequently asked or consulted because of expertise, other personal traits |
| 5 | Others see me as a leader, people trust me and/or respect me |
| 6 | Fulfilling mission of the college, working for the good of the organization |
| 7 | Empower others, advocate for others, provide support, mentor, motivate others, role model, set example |
| 8 | Me-centered, I am successful, I have the ability to make things happen |

- 9 Teamwork, inclusiveness, collaboration, building consensus
- 10 Influence, power, authority, control financial resources
- 11 Not a leader, experiencing barriers to being a leader, or too new in the position to be a leader

Table 2 Gender Differences in Primary Themes

Coding Theme	Percentage Male (n = 396)	Percentage Female (n = 286)
Positional, responsibilities, committees, decision making related to job function, experience, leader within area	49.2	45.1
Change agent, initiate change, create environment for change	7.8	8.7
Provide vision, shape direction	7.1	7.0
Knowledge, personal mastery, expertise, frequently asked or consulted because of expertise, other personal traits	6.1	8.0
Others see me as a leader, people trust me and/or respect me	5.1	4.5
Fulfilling mission of the college, working for the good of the organization	2.8	3.8
Empower others, advocate for others, provide support, mentor, motivate others, role model, set example	3.1	3.1
Me-centered, I am successful, I have the ability to make things happen	3.3	1.7
Teamwork, inclusiveness, collaboration, building consensus	1.3	2.8
Influence, power, authority, control financial resources	1.8	2.1
Yes, but no explanation	6.8	7.0
Not a leader, experiencing barriers to being a leader, or too new in the position to be a leader	5.8	5.9

Note: There were no significant gender differences.

Table 3 Position Differences in Primary Themes (in percentages)

Legend for Chart:

- A - Presidents, Provosts (n = 86)
- B - Academic Affairs (n = 131)
- C - Student Affairs (n = 98)
- D - Occupational and Continuing Education (n = 151)
- E - Administrative Areas, Business Affairs, Institutional Research, Human Resources, and Development (n = 162)
- F - Learning Resources/ Distance Education (n = 54)

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Positional, responsibilities, committees, decision making related to job function, experience, leader within area	43.0	46.6	49.0	48.3	52.5(a)	37.0(a)
Change agent, initiate change, create environment for change	4.7	10.7	11.2	9.3	5.6	7.4
Provide vision, shape direction	19.8(b)	8.4	4.1	3.3	6.8	0.0
Knowledge, personal mastery, expertise, frequently asked or consulted because of expertise, other personal traits	1.2(c)	6.9	9.2(c)	6.6	8.6	7.4
Others see me as a leader, people trust me and/or respect me	1.2(d)	8.4(d)	4.1	6.7	2.5(d)	5.6
Fulfilling mission of the college, working for the good of the organization	3.5	1.5	5.1	3.3	2.5	5.6
Empower others, advocate for others, provide support, mentor, motivate others, role model, set example	1.2	3.8	2.0	3.3	3.7	3.7
Me-centered, I am successful, I have the ability to make things happen	4.7	0.8	2.0	2.6	3.1	3.7
Teamwork, inclusiveness, collaboration, building consensus						

2.3	3.(!)	1.0	0.7	1.9	3.7
Influence, power, authority, control financial resources					
3.5	1.5	1.0	4.0	0.6	0.0
Yes, but no explanation					
14.0	6.9	6.1	3.3	7.4	5.6
Not a leader experiencing barriers to being a leader, or too new in the position to be a leader					
1.2(e)	1.5(e)	5.1	8.6(e)	4.9	20.4(e)

(a). Administrative areas were significantly more likely than learning resources/distance education to indicate positional, responsibilities, etc. ($p = .041$).

(b). Presidents were significantly more likely to indicate provide vision, shape direction ($p < .05$ for each position category).

(c). Student affairs administrators were more likely than presidents/provosts to indicate knowledge, personal mastery, expertise, etc. ($p = .021$).

(d). Academic affairs administrators were more likely than presidents/provosts ($p = .03$) and more likely than those in administrative areas ($p = .03$) to indicate that others see them as leaders.

(e). In all instances, learning resources/distance education administrators were more likely to indicate that they were not leaders at their institutions. Those in administrative areas were also more likely than presidents/provosts ($p = .021$) or academic affairs administrators ($p = .008$) to indicate that they were not leaders.

References

Astin, A., & Astin, H. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered*. Battle Creek, MI: Kellogg Foundation. (ED 444437)

Baker, G. A., & Associates. (1992). *Cultural leadership: Inside America's community colleges*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Baldwin, R. G. (1998). *Technology's impact on faculty life and work*. In K. H. Gillespie (Ed.), *The impact on technology on faculty development, life, and work* (pp. 7-21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). *From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education*. *Change*, 27(5), 12-25.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1, ED 316 074 MF-01). Washington DC: George Washington University.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, W. & Shapiro, H. (1998). *Universities and their leadership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Chliwniak, L. (1997). *Higher education leadership: Analyzing the gender gap* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report [Vol. 25, No. 4]). Washington, DC: ASHE.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, E. B. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, J. (2003). *Learning to lead*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education/Praeger.

Dever, J. T. (1997). *Reconciling educational leadership and the learning organization*. *Community College Review*, 25(2), 57-63.

DiCroce, D. (1995). *Women and the community college presidency: Challenges and possibilities*. In B. K. Townsend (Ed.), *Gender and power in the community college. New directions for community colleges* (No. 89). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dolence, M. G., & Norris, D. M. (1995). *Transforming higher education: A vision for learning in the 21st century*. Ann Arbor, MI: Society for College and University Planning.

Evelyn, J. (2001). *Community colleges face a crisis of leadership*. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36(31), A36.

Getskow, V. (1996). *Women in community college leadership roles*. *ERIC digest* (ED400025). Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (2003). *Women faculty and part-time employment: The impact of public policy*. In B. Ropers-Huilman (Ed.), *Gendered futures in higher education: Critical perspectives for change* (pp. 97-110). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gratton, M. (1993). *Leadership in the learning organization*. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 84, 93-103.

Green, M. (1997). *No time for heroes*. *Trusteeship*, 5(2), 6-11.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Gronn, P. (2000). *Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership*. *Educational Management & Administration*, 28(3), 317-338.

Gumport, P. J. (2003). *The demand-response scenario: Perspectives of community college presidents*. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 586, 38-61.

Haney, W., Russell, M., Gulek, C., & Fierros, E. (1998). *Drawing on education: Using student drawings to promote middle school improvement*. *Schools in the Middle*, 7(3), 38-43.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

Helgesen, S. (1995). *The web of inclusion: A new architecture for building great organizations*. New York: Currency/Doubleday.

Horner, M. (1997). *Leadership theory: Past, present, & future*. *Team Performance Management*, 3(4), 270-287.

Hurtado, S., & Dey, E. L. (1997). *Achieving the goals of multiculturalism and diversity*. In M. Peterson, D. D. Dill, L. Mets, & Associates (Eds.), *Planning and management for a changing environment* (pp. 405-431). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnstone, D. B. (1999). *The challenge of planning in public*. *Planning for Higher Education*, 28(2), 57-64.

Kelley, R. E. (1998). *In praise of followers*. In W. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (4th ed., pp. 96-106). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Kezar, A. (2003). *Achieving student success: Strategies for creating partnerships between academic and student affairs*. *NASPA Journal*, 41(1), 1-22.

Lewis, M. D. (1989). *Effective leadership strategies for the community college president*. Long Beach, CA: Long Beach City College. (ED307948)

Lucey, C. A. (2002). *Civic engagement, shared governance, and community colleges*. *Academe*, 88(4), 27-31.

Nidiffer, J. (2001). *New leadership for a new century*. In J. Nidiffer & C. Bashaw (Eds.), *Women administrators in higher education* (pp. 101-131). Albany: State University of New York Press.

O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education Oryx Press Series on Higher Education.

Peterson, M. (1997). *Using contextual planning to transform institutions*. In M. Peterson, D. Dill, L. A. Mets, & Associates (Eds.), *Planning and management for a changing environment* (pp. 127-157). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pfeffer, J. (1991). *The ambiguity of leadership*. In M. Peterson (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (4th ed., pp. 345-354). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.

Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., III, & Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Rowley, D. J., & Sherman, H. (2001). *From strategy to change: Implementing the plan in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges Press.

Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Stemler, S. (2001). *An introduction to content analysis*. College Park, MD: ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation.

Townsend, B. K., & Twombly, S. B. (1998). *A feminist critique of organizational change in the community college*. In J. S. Levin (Ed.), *Organizational change in the community college: A ripple or a sea change?* (pp. 77-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Twombly, S. B. (1995). *Gendered images of community college leadership: What messages they send*. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 23(1), 67-77.

VanDerLinden, K. (2003, April). *Career advancement and leadership development of community college administrators*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Vaughan, G. B. (1986). *The community college presidency*. New York: Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. (1989a). *Female community college presidents*. *Community College Review*, 17(2), 20-24. Vaughan, G. B. (1989b). *Leadership in transition: The community college presidency*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education/Oryx Press Series on Higher Education.

Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2002). *The community college presidency, 2001*. AACC Research Brief Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

~~~~~

By Pamela L. Eddy and Kim E. VanDerLinden

Pamela L. Eddy is an assistant professor and doctoral program coordinator at Central Michigan University.

Kim E. VanDerLinden is the director of assessment services at Student Voice.

---

Copyright of Community College Review is the property of Sage Publications Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.